G. R. S. 58

Previous references.

3-8 Jub 1) 28/12 B. Jug. 1906-7

Later references.

Bo. Marg 08 88/2. G.J. 390 of 0)
Bo Marg 07-2. 4 471-08
Gen 2-10-29, 35, 39, 45
pp 63-18 Slot-4.
PP 98-09 (1-2)
PP 121/20 (1-3)

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

D.D. 1-24-20 to 23.
P.P. 7-00 [illegible]

Serial Nos. 165 811

P.P. 34-24-1
P.P. 34-24-142
P.P. 34-24-164 18, 20.
P.P. 32-30-26.

Part B. for November 07

SUBJECT.

Expenditure incurred for arranging for lunch to H.H. the Maharaja of Indore

1). From the Comptroller. No 591/137. G.J. 29.1 (G. 30 491).
Advert to G.O. G 127/06 regarding a bill for Rs on account of the expenditure incurred for arranging for luncheon to H.H. the Maharaja of Indore at Madura on 29 and states that the charge in question is of the same nature as that referred to in his letter G 6-2 06 and that it has, therefore, been debited to "Miscellaneous" pending the receipt of the connected papers in this docket No. 30 G 491/07 G.J. 15-1-07

GEB ..8,000—7-4-07

inquiries when the further reference promised may be expected

From the Private to H.H.

No 663 of 6.9.06 (2 Pl 674)

~~Enquiries~~ Replies to the above on behalf of the Palace Officer, furnishing the information as to how such charges are to meet.

To the Comptr No Pl 4340 of 6.9.06

Request with reference to his letter No 1582/806 of 7.2.06, to state under what authority actual travelling expenses of H.H.'s lorries are debited to the State, not to the bird list.

From the Comptroller.

No. 3351/2A.D. of I of 1906

Furnishes the information asked for in the above.

To the Comptroller, Palace Officer, & P.Secy to H.H.

No Pl 2428-30 of 22.11

Lays down certain principles for apportioning the charges of H.H.'s between the State & the Palace Estate

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

II

(General Finance)

NOTES.

Adverts to G.O. dated 12.7.06 regarding a bill for Rs 30/- on account of the expenditure incurred for arranging for luncheon to H.H. the Maharajah Saheb at Maddur on 29.5.06 & States that the charge in question is of the same nature as that referred to in his letter D 6.2.06 & that it has therefore been debited to "Suspense" pending the receipt of the Communication promised in this office docket No: RE 6945/ G/Fin 160-05-6 dt 23.4.06

NOTES AND ORDERS.

This Letter refers

[illegible] in his letter No. 131 dated 11.1.06 in regard to the Expenditure incurred during the month of August 1905 for the intended trip to Simla. may he be requested to state when this refd may be submitted

Gen Am File No. 45 of 1906

The Original Objection raised by the Comptroller in his letter of 7.2.06 has not been seen by the Secy to SO This — Subd for information. The case will be re-Subd on receipt of the further Communication promised by the Palace Office —

Mch 19.06

Mch 27/06

Mch 27 06

To the Palace Officer, No: H: 1738 of the 21.8.06.

Enquires when the further reference promised may be expected.

From the Private Secy to His Highness.

Replies, on behalf of the Palace Officer, that the precise principles according to which charges incurred during His Highness' tours should be apportioned between the State & the Palace have never been laid down. That no distinction has been made between the different classes of Expenses incurred. That on the occasion on which the charges under discussion were incurred, the object of the contemplated Journey was of a purely public nature & having regard to precedents, it seems right that they should be accepted as a State charge.

The Private Secretary to His Highness the

Maharaja States that in all cases in which the tours were undertaken partly on account of the performance of a public duty & partly on account of His Highness' pleasure, the Costs have been divided, after discussion, between the Govt. Comptr. & the Palace Controller

In the present case, it was wholly on the performance of a public duty & therefore has to be borne by the State.

Regarding the Sumptuary charges, Pay & batta to Servants all amounting to Rs. 509-8-[illegible] placed under objection by the Comptr. as being properly debitable to the Palace, the Private Secy points out that all these Expenses were directly connected with the Journey & were the minimum that could be incurred if His Highness was to travel in a befitting manner & the Servants employed were not to be subjected to unnecessary hardship

Submitted for orders to Secy

K.S. 10.9.06

16.9.6

2276 12.9.06

Refer to C. (M.O.) Dewan's order The Comptroller may be consulted unofficially in the matter

B.C.B. 12/9/06

MGCPB—50,000—24-7-05

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Gen Fin File No. 45 of 1906

Serial No.

To The Comptroller

No 7665 & 15-10-06
2 files & Notes
papers as per list

CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
19. OCT. 1906
(86)
MYSORE

McCandless Walker
13-10-06 Dec'y to Govt

Nos. Nos 7665 & 19-10-06.

I am afraid I can not accept the charges against the State on the grounds stated in the Private Secretary's letter. The incidence of charges is determined by classification in the accounts and classification again has nothing to do with the object of the expenditure. The Palace servants are all paid out of the Palace grant and all charges on their account should be paid from the same source on whatever duty they may be employed. If we were to try to divide the expenditure of any State department among certain heads of account with reference to the nature of the work on which the department may be employed at any time - then the scheme would lead to an intolerable nuisance. For example, the Police Constables do duty for the general public as well as the State departments. If on account of important State functions occurring too frequently a new distribution of

Serial No.

clothes was purchased for the men or they were given special allowances, We could not charge the salaries & the cost of the special functions but should certainly treat them as special charges of the Police Department

In dealing with accounts and classification - We deal with questions of Services. We charge to the Police grant head of accounts the cost of all that can be brought under the heading of Police Service. So in the case of the Palace Grant, His Highness has fixed a grant for certain personal Services to himself and the ~~charge~~ to the grant should be the cost of all these services irrespective of the occasions for the services.

I have no doubt in my mind that these charges should be debited to the Palace grant

5/5 Plus 22/10/06 4/2/07 4/2/07

In his letter of 7th Feb 06 (Flag Z) the Comptt states that he has adjusted certain charges incurred for H.H's tour. He may be asked to state under what authority actual travelling expenses of H.H's tours are debited to the State + not to the Civil List B.O. 4B 4/2/06

NOTE—Contn. sheet

Do 4/2/06

brought forward 4/2/06

KEPB—50,000—23 10-05

Gen Tur File No. 45 of 1906

Submitted with a draft accord
K.S.
3/12/06

4.12.06

To the Comptroller
No: 7C 4343 Dy 6th December 1906
Invites attention to his letter No: 4382/806 dated the 7th February 1906 admitting certain charges incurred in Connection with H.H. the Maharaja's tour in August 1905, and requests to state under what authority — actual travelling expenses of His Highness' tours are debited to the State, and not to the Civil List.

From the Comptroller
No: 3351/J.A.D. Gr I Dy
13.12.06

In reply to the above, observes that it is recognised that all tour expenses of His Highness in the Province are Palace charges, but that in the Case of State visits by His Highness outside the Province on purely public

Gen 71

public grounds, some part of the expenditure involved, such as the hiring of special trains and houses and carriages outside the Province of Mysore, is considered to be a proper charge against the General Revenues, that the charges incurred in connection with H. H. the Maharaja's tour in August '905 were (he understands) on account of a special tour of the above nature outside the Province, that as the Govt. Sanction in No: H 4445-6/Gen-Fin 160-05 dated 11.1.06 implied that the point whether that was a special tour justifying debit to General Revenues of locomotion charges must have been considered and decided, the actual travelling expenses were passed in audit, & that the Sumptuary charges and expenses of similar nature have been objected to because in no circumstance can such charges pertaining to the Palace Establishment be adjusted outside the Palace accounts & states that he ~~will~~ take steps to prefer a fresh claim against the Palace

G.R.S. 12]
General and Revenue
Secretariat.

Gen Jun File No.

Govt if the orders of 11th January 06
were issued by Govt without due
consideration of the question whether
the particular tour was on purely
public grounds.

submitted to Secy for orders
Hon 18-12-06

21-12-6

In para 2 and 4 ... Colle
Baker suggests certain con
governing whether charges ... to
be debited to the Palace or to the ... and
revenues ... he thinks ... it
seem very desirable to
iate difficult & delicat
to the incidence of charg

Submitted to His Highness

I submit for orders a file relating to the adjustment of certain charges incurred during the urs of His Highness.

The question first arose in connection with the intended tour of His Highness to Simla in August 1905. which was subsequently cancelled. In connection with this tour, a Government order was passed on 11th January 1906, sanctioning a bill for Rs.3,807/- on account of expenses incurred and forwarding it to the Comptroller for audit.

In auditing the bill, the Comptroller accepted certain charges and objected to certain others, amounting to Rs.509 and odd, which involved sumptuary charges, pay and batta of servants, and which could not be considered as actual travelling expenses. On this objection being communicated to the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments, that officer desired in April 1906 that the amount referred to might be held under suspense pending a further communication on the subject.

Again, in July 1906, Government sanctioned a bill for Rs.30 being expenses incurred by the Deputy Commissioner, Mysore, for arranging luncheon for His Highness and suite at Maddur on the 29th May 1906.

The Comptroller objected to passing this charge also and placed it under suspense pending the decision of the question raised in the case already referred to.

On this, the Officer in charge of the Palace Establishments was reminded about the further communication promised by him; and in reply to this, the Private Secretary to His Highness wrote in September 1906, making certain observations as to how His Highness' tour charges had been debited to State and Palace formerly and stating that on the same principle the items under objection should be debited to the State. This letter was communicated to the Comptroller un-officially and in his note dated 19th October 1906, Mr. Basu controverted the arguments advanced in Mr. Maconochie's letter and expressed his opinion that the charges under objection should be debited to the Palace.

Papers under submission

In a subsequent letter dated 13th December 1906, Mr. Basu lays down certain principles on which

charges of His Highness' tours should be apportioned between the State and the Palace grant. These are -

1) that all tour expenses of His Highness withi the Province are Palace charges;

2) that in the case of State visits by His Highness outside the Province on purely public grounds some part of the expenditure involved such as the hiring of special trains and horses and carriages outside the Province of Mysore is a proper charge against General revenues;

3) that even in the case referred to in (2) umptuary charges and expenses of similar nature pertaining to the Palace Establishment should be charged to the Palace grant.

His Highness agrees with the views expressed by Mr. Basu, the particular charges that have been objected to, will have to be debited to the Palace grant.

The Palace, Mysore,

9th November 1907.

2062/1886.

Dear Mr Madhava Rao

His Highness has given the question at issue in this case full consideration and he now desires me to communicate his views.

He agrees that it is most desirable that definite principles should be laid down for the apportionment of charges incurred in connection with his tours. The precedents for the past 20 years have been examined and though they are to some extent conflicting, they would admit of a strong case being made out for the debit of almost the entire charges to the State. His Highness does not, however, desire to press that point, his only desire being to arrive at a settlement that will be equitable in itself and will terminate once and for all unseemly and undesirable discussions between the Comp-

and the Palace authorities and relieve the former officer of an invidious obligation.

7 In His Highness' opinion the following settlement will secure this end.

(1) The cost of Provincial tours, which His Highness views in the light of a duty that he owes to his people, will be debited entirely to the Civil List.

(2) As regards tours outside the Provinces, all Railway charges incurred on account of himself and his suite and all expenses on account of house accommodation will be borne by the State. The same applies to all charges on account of hire of conveyances and the carriage of his own conveyances by rail, including horses, carriages and other cars. All other charges on such tours
the Palace.

As to (2) His Highness deems it necessary to draw a distinction between tours taken solely with a view to the discharge of a public duty and others. It is almost impossible in these days, when the interests of all parts of India are so inter-

woven and the relations of Mysore with other provinces are so widely extended and intricate, to draw a clear line of demarcation between one kind of tour and another. It is equally difficult to say where the public duty of an Indian Prince, with his innumerable responsibilities, Imperial and Provincial, begins or ends. Any distinction will is His Highness' opinion merely lead to a continuance of the existing unsatisfactory state of things.

If His Highness' view is accepted, the case on the accompanying file and other similar ones now pending may be disposed of accordingly.

Yours sincerely

Macworth

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

Subject.

Adjustment of certain charges incurred during the tours of His Highness the Maharaja.

Secretary's letter No 62 D/ 1907

Recd. 9.11.07

Please refer the Comptroller to my memorandum D.O. of the 9th inst. & tell him that the decision therein cannot be accepted as final & all outstanding charges adjusted on the principles laid down in that decision. D/ 11/11/07

For Private secretary please see D.O. 11/11

Submitted with a draft letter
to the Comptroller.

K.S. This may be dealt with as a
15.11.07 Financial case

(Lord Lee) for my
before issue

Please embody the instructions
given in the Do. in the orde

Draft order Submitted.
K.S.
19.11.07. Issue as revised

re Compte, Officer in charge of Palace
the Private Secy to HH.
No. 2428-30 22.11.07
Lays down certain principles for
apportioning the charges of HH's
between the State & the Palace &
requests the Compte to adjt
all outstanding charges in
accordance with these principles

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVERNMENT,

Dated Bangalore, the 29 July 1906.

RAI N. G. BASU BAHADUR, M.A.,
COMPTROLLER, MYSORE GOVERNMENT.

To

K. S. Chandrasekhara Iyer Esq.. B.A.B.L. Dlo No 45-06.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
General & Revenue DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. Dl 293-4 / Dl F. 35-8-05-2 dated the 12th instant forwarding for audit a bill for Rs. 30/- on account of the expenditure incurred for arranging for luncheon to H.H. the Maharajah and Suite at Madras on the 29th May '06, I have the honour to state that the charge in question is of the same nature as that referred to in my letter No. 4382 / F.A.D. 806 dated the 6th February last, and it has therefore been debited to "Suspense" pending the receipt of the communication promised in your docket No. Dl 6945 / Dl F. 160-05-6 dated the 23rd April last.

I have the honour to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

N. G. Basu
Comptroller.

D.491

From

Rai N. G. Basu Bahadur, M.A.,
Comptroller, Mysore Gov

To

Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Rev. & Agl ——Dept.

Dated

Despatched 30-7-06

Received

No. S-91

the question is of the same nature as that referred to in my letter no. 4382/886 26-2-06

Diary No. of letter replied to A 91

No. FC 1738
R 21-8-06

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Gen: Sec:)
the 21-8-1906

Date of issue do

Signed by W. McKerrell

To
The officer in charge of
the Palace Secs:

Sir,

I am directed to invite
your attention to your letter, no:
131 of the 11.4.06, stating that
auditing of certain charges of
expenditure incurred in connection
with the abandoned visit to Simla
of His Majesty the King Emperor
in August 1905, may be held in
suspense pending a further reference
from you in the matter and to
request you to be so good as to
state when the further reference from
may be expected.

I have the honour
to be
Sir
Your obedient
servant
K.S. 21/8/06

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Dated Palace, Mysore, 6-9- *190*

E. MACONOCHIE, Esq., I. C. S.,
PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
H. H THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, General and Revenue Departments.

I am directed to address you with reference to the correspondance ending with your No. Fl-1738 Gl, Fin-45-0[illegible] of the 21st August 1906 to the address of the Officer in charge, Palace Establishments.

2. The precise principles on which charges incurred in connection with His Highness' tours should be apportioned between the State and the Palace have never been laid down. On former occasions when a tour has been undertaken by His Highness solely performance of a public duty, or alternately, for Hi Highness' own pleasure, the costs have been charged in their entirety to the State in the former case

or to the Palace in the latter. No distinction has been made between the different classes of expenses incurred. When his journeys have had a two-fold object, expenses have been divided after discussion between the Comptroller and the Palace Controller.

On the occasion when the charges under discussi were incurred, the object of the contemplated journe was of a purely public nature and having regard to precedents, it seems right that they should be accepted as a State charge. The expenses were directly connected with the journey and were the minimum that could be incurred if His Highness was to travel in a befitting manner and the servants employed were not to be subjected to unnecessary hardship.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

P. Raghavendrachar

For Private Secretary.

*Diary No. of letter replied to*__

No JB 4343
GL Jm 48-06-
26 Dec 06

General and Revenue Secretariat

To The Comptroller.

Sir,

Date of issue do

Signed by Miller Knight

I am W.M. reference to your letter no: 591/137 of the 30.7.0 stating that you have debite to "Suspense" the amt of the bill sanctioned in G.O: no: H: 293-4/Gen: Fin: 358-05 of the 12th July 1906 on account of the Expenditure incurred in arranging for luncheon to His Highness the Maharaja + Suite at Maddur on the 29th May 1906, I am directe to invite attention to your letter no: 4382/806 of the 7.12.1906 admitting certain charges incurred in connection

with His Highness' late Maharaja's
tour in August 1905 and to
request you to be so good
as to state under what
authority actual travelling
Expenses of His Highness' tours
are debited to the State and
not to the Civil List.

I have.

Sd/- 4/2/16
J. Scrutton.

Gen Fin 45-06

Office of the Comptroller, Mysore Government.

Dated Bangalore, the 13 December 1906.

Rai N.G. Basu Bahadur, M.A.,
Comptroller, Mysore Government.

K.S. Chandrasekhara Iyer, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. Fl.4343/Fin.45-06-4 dated the 6th current, in which you ask me to state the authority under which actual travelling expenses of His Highnesse's Tours are debited to the State and not to the Civil List.

2. In reply, I have the honour to observe that it is recognised that all tour expenses of His Highness in the Province are Palace charges. But in the case of State Visits by His Highness outside the Province on purely public grounds, some part of the expenditure involved, such as the hiring of special trains and houses and carriages outside the Province of Mysore, is considered to be a proper charge against the General

3. The charges incurred in connection with the Maharaja's tour in August 1905 were I understand, on account of a special tour of the above nature outside the Province and as the Government sanction in their order No. Fl. 4445-6/Gl.Fl. 160-05-2 date the 11th January 1906 implied that the point whether that was a special tour justifying debit to General Revenues of locomotion charges must have been considered and decided - the actual travelling expenses were passed in audit.

4. The sumptuary charges and expenses of similar nature have been objected to, because in no circumstances can such charges pertaining to the Palace establishment be adjusted outside the Palace accounts.

5. If, as appears likely from the present inquiry by the Government, the orders of 11th January 1906 were issued by Government without due consideration of the question whether the particular tour was on purely public grounds, then on being apprised of the fact, I shall take steps to prefer a fresh claim against the Palace for expenses already passed against General Revenues.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Comptroller.

Diary No. of letter replid to 2415

GENERAL AND REVENUE
SECRETARIAT.
(Gl. Sec.)

The 190

Date of issue 22nd Nov 07

Signed by [illegible]

Correspondence ending with the Comptroller's letter, no: 3351 of the 13th December 1906, on the Subject Re of the allotment of charges incurred in connection with the tours of His Highness the Maharaja both in Province

~~ORDER THEREON. No.~~

No 76 2428-30 orders
of 22nd Nov 07

e Govt are pleased to lay down
following principles for apportioning
charges of His Highness' tours
between the State & the Palace
the guidance of the board

Tours within the Province

(a) All tour expenses of His Highness the Maharaja within the Province will be debited entirely to the Civil Head.

The cost of Provincial tours, which His Highness the Maharaja visits in the light of a duty that His Highness owes to the people, will be debited entirely to the Civil List -

Tours outside the Province -

~~In the case of His Highness'~~
As regards tours outside the Province, all Railway charges incurred on account of ~~himself & his~~ Suite and all expenses on account of house accommodation will be borne entirely by the Sta
The same rule applies to all charges on account of hire of conveyan

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

the carriage of his own Conveyance by rail including horses Carriages & motor Cars

(c) All other charges on such tours will be debited to the Palace.

2. The Comptroller will ~~receive~~ this decision as final and ~~proceed to~~ adjust all outstanding charges in accordance with the principles herein laid down.

18/ 19.11.

for Secy to Govt.

~~Fin & Rev Secy~~

Finance Secy

To the Comptroller to get the officer in charge of the Palace Accts: with refee to the Corr^ce ending with this D^o letter No. H: 1738 of the 21-8-06 the Private Sy to His Highness the Maharaja with refee to the Corr^ce ending with his letter No: 65 of the 6.9.06

K.S. 19/11/07.